



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,504	09/23/2003	Kazuma Aoki	117278	1916
25944	7590	02/11/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				HAMDAN, WASSEEM H
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2854				

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/667,504	AOKI, KAZUMA
	Examiner Wassem H Hamdan	Art Unit 2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/23/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of "electing Species (a) corresponds to at least claims 1-3" in the Response to Restriction Requirement filed on 01/14/2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "the subject matter of all species are sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one species would encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining species". This is not found persuasive because there are nine patentably distinct inventions as stated in the specification and as set forth in the office action mailed on 11/16/2004, and concurrently recited in the nine independent claims 1, 4, 9 and 14-19. The examiner understands that there are some common elements between the claims, but they are patentably distinct inventions. In order to conduct a complete search and to map every single limitation to the prior art for the nine patentably distinct inventions, there will be a serious burden on the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 4-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: -- A PRINTING APPARATUS PERFORMING BIDIRECTIONAL COMMUNICATION CONNECTED TO WAN AND LAN --.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because

- a. FIG. 1, box 1, requires a descriptive legend such as -- printing apparatus --;
- b. FIG. 2:
 - i. the big rectangular box, requires a descriptive legend such as --printing apparatus --;
 - ii. box 109, requires a descriptive legend such as -- connection terminal --;
 - iii. box 95, requires a descriptive legend such as -- bus --;
 - iv. box 110, requires a descriptive legend such as -- web printing unit --;
 - v. The small box that includes boxes 110, 109, 101, 103, 105 and 107 requires a descriptive legends such as -- communication module --;
 - vi. box 4, requires a descriptive legend such as -- port --;
 - vii. box 6, requires a descriptive legend such as -- port --; and
 - viii. box 7, requires a descriptive legend such as -- port --.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kageyama (US 6,333,790 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Kageyama discloses a printing apparatus connected to a first network [110] and a second network [120] and capable of performing a bidirectional data communication [702; 703] with a server computer [300] connected to the first network [110] and with an information terminal [400] connected to the second network [120], comprising,

printing unit [2200] configured to print an image on printing medium based on externally input data [column 9, lines 31-34];

a sending and receiving unit [2110] configured to send the server computer a request signal received from the information terminal and to receive content data sent, as a response to the request signal, from the server computer [column 6, lines 23-29; column 15, lines 7-17];

a print execution determining unit [2120] configured to determine, on the basis of a predetermined determination condition, whether the content data is to be printed [column 6, lines 12-17; column 7, lines 37-41; column 10, lines 17-24]; and

a print control unit [2142; 2150] configured to cause the printing unit to print the content data in a case where the print execution determining unit determines that the content data be printed [column 6, lines 40-65; column 15, lines 7-18].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kageyama (US 6,333,790 B1) in view of Sharma (Pub. No.: US 2003/0081247 A1).

Regarding claim 2, Kageyama discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention, but Kageyama is silent about the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication setting is made. However, Sharma discloses the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication setting is made [FIG. 5; page 3, section [0027]]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kageyama by including the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication setting is made, since Sharma teaches that having the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication setting is made would be beneficial for the purpose of providing a system with securely controlling the printing of a document [Sharma: page 1, section [0006], lines 2-3].

Regarding claim 3, Kageyama discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention, but Kageyama is silent about wherein the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password. However, Sharma discloses wherein the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password [page 2, section [0013], lines 4-8]. It

would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kageyama by including wherein the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password, since Sharma teaches that having the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password would be beneficial for the purpose of providing a system with securely controlling the printing of a document [Sharma: page 1, section [0006], lines 2-3].

9. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kageyama (US 6,333,790 B1) in view of Baird et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0223093 A1).

Regarding claim 2, Kageyama discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention, but Kageyama is silent about the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication setting is made. However, Baird et al. discloses the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication setting is made [page 2, section [0024]]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kageyama by including the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication setting is made, since Sharma teaches that having the control unit performs a control for printing only in a case where case where a validity of the printing is authenticated in a case where an authentication

setting is made would be beneficial for the purpose of preventing unauthorized access to the document [Baird et al.: page 2, section [0224], lines11-12].

Regarding claim 3, Kageyama discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention, but Kageyama is silent about wherein the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password. However, Baird et al. discloses wherein the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password [page 2, section [0024]]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kageyama by including wherein the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password, since Baird et al. teaches that having wherein the print control unit performs the control for printing only in a case where an input password coincides with a pre-stored password would be beneficial for the purpose of preventing unauthorized access to the document [Baird et al.: page 2, section [0224], lines11-12].

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wasseem H Hamdan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2166. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (first Friday off) 6:30 AM- 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Wasseem H. Hamdan

February 3, 2005